

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 18, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-13 were pending and rejected claims 1-13. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claims 14 and 15 have been added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 6 stands objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office asserts that the claim is improperly identified. The claim is currently amended and is now properly identified.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for introducing new matter. In particular, the Office states that the amended claim 2 recites "said titles and the inputted text and titles appear as single linear text in at least one text zone" which is not supported by the Specification.

In ¶ 0206 of the printed publication version of the Specification, it is stated "[d]uring step 808, in at least one

text zone, the titles defined by the standard and the text input by the user appear, like a single linear text, to be shown in the second to the seventh tables above.” Also, ¶ 0211 states “[f]inally, the program performs step 826 to supply the document, for example, display or printing, according to the user/addressee's selection. As indicated above, in at least one text zone, the titles defined by the standard and the text input by the user appear as a single linear text.” Thus, the Applicant submits that the Specification does contain support for claim 2 and therefore no new matter was added as asserted by the Office.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office asserts “said titles and notifications and the inputted text and titles appear as single linear text in at least one text zone,” is not supported by the Specification.

The Applicant submits for the reasons discussed above, claim 2 is properly described in the Specification.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman, U.S. Patent No. 6,988,241 in view of Devine, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite ***"the step of defining also defining at least one selection attribute for selecting information items from said document;*** inputting, by said first user, said information, the step of inputting being comprised of inputting text and/or titles to the general framework and selecting values authorized on said fields, ***the input information items being associated with at least one selection attribute based on the document standard;*** transmitting said information from said first user to storage for each secondary user; selecting, by each secondary user, a sorting criterion ***applicable to at least one selection attribute defined by the document standard; selecting information items of the document and re-organizing the selected information items of the document according to said sorting criterion and selection attributes associated with said information items;*** and supplying, to the secondary user, ***the selected information items of the document re-organized according to said sorting criterion."*** (Emphasis added) Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in ¶ 0210 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 1.

Guttman discusses a web-based spreadsheet allowing people to collaborate and to share spreadsheets over the web. The content of the spreadsheet includes cell contents only available via the web (e.g., URLs of images as described in Col. 2, lines 3-6).

Thus, the content of the spreadsheet varies thanks to web contents. However, the spreadsheet does not vary according to the destines' choice (i.e., the "second users" in the claim language).

Therefore, Guttman does not describe, teach or suggest defining selection attributes for selecting information from a document ... associating the input information with selection attributes based on the document standard ... applying a sorting criterion to the selection attributes defined by the document standard and/or ... selecting and reorganizing information items of the document according to the sorting criterion and the selection attributes associated with said information items ... so each second user is supplied with selected information items that are organized according to his/her own sorting criterion.

Devine discusses a common user interface for viewing and receiving a report outputs. However, Devine fails to teach the features of the claimed invention missing in Guttman.

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner consistent with claim 1. Various dependent claims have likewise been amendment for consistency. For at least the reasons discussed above,

Guttman and Devine, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in view of McKaskey, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152245.

McKaskey adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and McKaskey, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 2.

Claims 6, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guttman in view of Devine in further view of Brittan, U.S. Patent No. 6,199,078. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Brittan adds nothing to the combination of Guttman and Devine as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Guttman, Devine and Brittan, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 6, 10 and 13.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 14 and 15 are new. Support for claims 14 and 15 may be found, for example, in ¶¶ 0073-0076 and 0210 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicant submits that no new matter is believed to have been added by the inclusion of claims 14 and 15. The prior art of record fails to disclose means for defining said document standard are adapted to define selection attribute by categories of information, said sorting criterion being based on said categories of information wherein the means for selecting and reorganizing selects and reorganizes information items of the document according to the categories of said information items; or the means for defining said document standard are adapted to define selection attribute by priority levels, the means for inputting further comprises means for associating a priority level with the information items, wherein the means for selecting are adapted to select a hierarchy of information based on said priority level of the information and wherein the means for selecting and reorganizing selects and reorganizes information items of the document according to the priority level of said information items.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 103 and 112. It is also submitted that claims 1-15 continue to be allowable. It is

further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/lad